

C. Remarks

The claims are 1-9 and 11-16, with claim 1 being the sole independent claim. Claim 10 has been cancelled. Claim 1 has been amended to better define the present invention. Support this amendment may be found throughout the specification, the claims and the drawings, for example, at page 15, line 15- page 16, line 12 (original specification), and in Fig. 2. Claims 2-6 have been amended to reflect the changes in claim 1. Claims 11-13 have been amended to reflect the cancellation of claim 10. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the present claims is expressly requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,321,001 B1 (Heflinger). Claims 1, 2, 10 and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0196502 A1 (Perner). Claims 11, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Perner. The grounds of rejection are respectfully traversed.

Prior to addressing the merits of rejection, Applicant would like to briefly discuss some of the key features and advantages of the presently claimed invention. The present invention is directed to an optical waveguide device, which contains a light direction-altering portion with a plurality of reflecting surface portions. Each of these reflecting surface portions corresponds to and reflects light from a predetermined light-emitting source. Thus, the location of the light-transmitting source can be determined (see original specification, page 15, line 15- page 16, line 12).

Heflinger is directed to an optical communication system. In Heflinger,

light can be reflected by a diffraction grating and is received by a light-receiving device. The light, however, is diffracted by the same surface. This is different from the presently claimed waveguide in which the light direction-altering portion has a plurality of reflective surface portions. Therefore, unlike in the presently claimed invention, the location of the light-transmitting source in Heflinger cannot be determined. Accordingly, Heflinger cannot affect the patentability of the presently claimed invention.

Perner is directed to an electrooptical component for sending and receiving electrical and optical signals. Perner teaches using a prism as a reflector. A single surface of this prism reflects light to the same optical access point (see Fig. 4; paragraph [0059]). Perner is not understood to teach or suggest reflecting light from multiple light-transmitting sources by different surface portions of the same light direction-altering portion. Specifically, Applicant submits that, like Heflinger, Perner does not disclose or suggest a light direction-altering portion, which has a plurality of reflective surface portions, wherein each of these reflecting surface portions corresponds to and reflects light from a predetermined light-emitting source. Thus, Perner cannot affect the patentability of the present claimed invention.

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the combination of elements presently claimed.

Wherefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the outstanding objection and rejections be withdrawn and that the present case be passed to issue.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by

telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant

Jason M. Okun

Registration No. 48,512

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 462222v1